

Party platforms define candidates

By Jill Hickey
Editor

EDITOR'S NOTE: The following platform explanations have been compiled after researching several recent periodicals. The editorial staff would like to point out that the *Courier* has not endorsed any of the candidates, but chose, instead, to present an overview to help readers individually choose a candidate to support.

A Democratic choice

If re-elected, President Carter hopes to use his "new lease on the executive mansion to build presidential control over federal bureaucracy."

Carter is promising a "comprehensive renewal program to provide long term economic growth." He feels this can best be accomplished through tighter control of the federal bureaucracy.

Carter's economic plan intends to stimulate research and development while modernizing industry. He hopes to attract business investments with tax breaks.

The Democratic platform put unemployment ahead of inflation as the chief economic problem in America. The president supports the repeal of section 14b of the Taft Hartley law which allows states to forbid union shops and he will continue to encourage organized labor.

Carter also hopes to carry out the many energy programs he passed through congress this year. The United States now imports approximately 20 per cent less oil than in 1976, and Carter supports a synthetic fuel corporation to develop even more alternatives to oil.

Democrats are proposing programs to "improve the quality of education and assure equal access to learning for all Americans." Consequently, Carter backs the federal Department of Education as well as busing.

Carter's platform emphasizes protection of minority groups to protect equality and he has expressed ardent support of the Equal Rights Amendment.



Carter also wants to increase the aid that America gives to Third World countries. "It is unacceptable that the United States ranks 13 among 17 major industrial powers in percentage of GNP devoted to developmental assistance," Carter says.

In the 1976 election, Carter urged military cuts, but this year, like Reagan, Carter is hoping to strengthen U.S. defenses. Therefore, both candidates support the building of the MX missile.

According to a White House spokesman, economic revitalization can be brought about through existing institutions and without vast amounts of federal aid. With this theme in mind, Carter supports his carefully planned platform to help "revive our country."



An Independent choice

Independent Party supporters feel that Representative John B. Anderson "offers an alternative to the pro-nuclear, pro-synfuel, timid conservation ideas of both the Democratic and Republican parties."

Anderson's stands on many issues directly oppose those of his national party contenders. However, he also emphasizes many of the economic concerns which the 1980 campaign reflects.

The Independent Party is targeting an increase in exported products, tax measures to help industries decrease exports, and an increase in government leadership.

To boost productivity in America, Anderson has introduced legislation to reduce taxes on savings account interest and supports legislation favoring new tax incentives.

Anderson opposes nuclear expansion but encourages the building of the Trident missile (a submersible submarine based missile system) and expanding the Navy to strengthen U.S. defense. He opposes a peacetime draft, however, and would like to give the volunteer Army "one more chance."

Anderson has been a long-time proponent of a separate Department of Education. He has also fought unwarranted federal intru-

sion into private education because of the maximum choice that a dual system offers parents and students. Anderson also supports busing for school desegregation.

Any context of discrimination is against Anderson's beliefs which is evident in his strong support of the Equal Rights Amendment and civil rights of homosexuals.

Anderson believes that the next president must "seriously consider the consequences of the aging of the U.S. population." He opposes mandatory retirement at 65 and supports efforts to end the limited earnings allowed with Social Security.

He feels the U.S. is too dependent on foreign oil and supports a 50 cent per gallon tax on all motor fuels to be used to reduce Social Security taxes, increase Social Security benefits, and allow tax credits for businesses.

In addition, Anderson supports the development of a synthetic fuel industry to find answers to questions of economic, environmental, and water conservation costs of synthetic fuels.

In the Middle East, Anderson feels that we "must create an environment in which Israel can feel secure while making the concessions necessary for a peaceful settlement."

A Republican choice

Ronald Reagan wants to restore America to the "economically prosperous and respected country that it used to be," according to his campaign proposals.

He is proposing tax cuts to aid both middle class families and corporations. At the same time, he wants to balance the budget which he says is grossly over-spent.

Reagan plans cuts in education and welfare programs. He hopes, however, to strengthen some individual social security programs, like Medicare and Medicaid.

He hopes to increase revenue by lifting the grain embargo and foreign restraints on exports.



Continued on page 8

Abortion issue concentrated in senate race

By Yvonne Yoerger
Staff Writer

If one-issue voting threatens to decide any major Iowa races this fall, the threat is most visible in the United States Senate campaign between Democratic incumbent John Culver and Republican challenger Charles Grassley.

Pro-life groups have thrown their support to Grassley, making abortion the single issue most discussed in the race. That reaction was typified at Culver's speech last Friday at Loras College. Anti-abortion groups and members of the John Birch Society showed up in Tuohy Auditorium with picket signs calling Culver a baby-killer, only to be met with supporters carrying signs saying Culver is not a one-issue man.

Culver voted against the Helms Human Life Amendment to the United States Constitution, which would protect the unborn from the moment of fertilization. Pro-lifers are also quick to point out that the National Abortion Rights Action League gave \$10,000 to Culver's campaign.

In defending his position Friday, Culver said the abortion decision should be left to the individual woman according to her beliefs, in order to keep the state out of religious issues. Culver also emphasized that the National Catholic Conference supports him for his overall human rights philosophy and voting record.

Despite what outside groups say about abortion, Culver and Grassley both say there are other equally important issues in their race. The two candidates, both from Des Moines, differ especially in their views on national defense and federal social service programs, and how those areas should be proportioned in the country's budget.

Culver, who holds a bachelor's degree in American Government from Harvard, with graduate studies at Cambridge University (England) and Harvard Law School, has given social services the priority in past votes. In 1965 he voted for the Older Americans Act and the Medicare Act. He has helped establish energy assistance and home weatherization programs for the elderly, as well as nutritious meal programs and a health insurance protection act. Culver's votes have helped adjust Social Security payments with inflation and raised tax revenues to prevent the Social Security fund from going bankrupt. These actions have earned Culver the support of many senior citizen organizations.

Grassley's priority has rested with national defense. As a United States Congressman from 1975-80, he voted against most of the measures Culver supported, as well as a Fair Housing Act and the federal Food Stamp program. Grassley received his Master's degree in political science from the University of Iowa. He has voted to increase the national defense budget, and even though he has voted to cut social service programs, he has said the budget can be maintained by increasing productivity, without across the board limits.

Culver, who has been a member of the United States Senate since 1975, has voted to cut funding for a federal missile program and has voted for arms control. He has advocated peaceful negotiations in southern African and Middle Eastern conflicts, while Grassley has been against such measures. Both men have voted in favor of registration for the draft.

In other foreign policy issues, both candidates have gone on record against President Carter's grain embargo on Russia, saying it hurts the American farmer and the general economy more than it hurts the Russians.

Culver has been supportive to world aid programs such as the Peace Corp, Food for Peace and the Inter-American Development Bank. He received a Distinguished Service Against Hunger Award in 1979 from the Bread for the World Organization. He has also been endorsed by the National League of Conservation Voters.

Grassley's votes to cut some world aid program funds have earned him support from the National Conservative Political Action Committee and the Committee for Another Responsible Senator, a group which was started for the sole purpose of defeating Culver.


Culver is an attorney and during his term in the Senate, he has served on the Armed Services, Environment and Public Works, Judiciary, and Small Business Committees. He served five terms in the United States House of Representatives before he was elected to the Senate, from 1965-1974.

Grassley, a farmer, has served on the House Agriculture, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committees and the Select Committee on Aging during his term. He also served for 16 years in the Iowa House of Representatives before winning his Congressional seat.



The symbolic donkey (democrat) and elephant (republican) are located at their respective headquarters where information on the candidates may be obtained.

photos by Marybeth Carroll



New Right stresses coalition politics

By Jill Hickey
Editor

This campaign has been like returning to school for some candidates. New Right groups have been grading candidates on the basis of how candidates compare with New Right morals in relation to the issues.

For instance, New Right groups would judge a candidate supporting nuclear expansion much higher than one supporting organized labor because New Right members value nuclear expansion more than organized labor.

According to Pam Jochum at the Democratic headquarters in Dubuque, New Right followers are made up of "ultra-ultra conservatives who are using their moral ethics to determine the morality and validity of candidates."

Jochum explained that many of the supporters are fundamentalist religious groups. "They are grading candidates on a morality scale based on fundamentalist religious ethics. Jochum feels the New Right supporters are using scare tactics to prey on people's fears and deceive liberals."

"Religious leaders should speak out when the government involves itself in family matters and moral issues."

— Viguerie

Richard Viguerie, one of the significant leaders behind this neo-conservative coalition points out that the New Right stresses "coalition politics rather than party politics."

"Coalition politics is also defined as single-issue politics. According to Viguerie, single-issue benefits can be compared with the success of the liberals who brought out left-wing issues and ended up "governing America for 40 years through the diverse coalition put together by FDR."

The general goal of the New Right is a drastic reduction of domestic government activity and a hard anti-communist line abroad.

The priorities of New Right followers include creation of coalitions among special interest groups, support and opposition on specific legislation, and concentration on Senate and House seats which can be won.

MS. magazine calls the New Right a "social and political movement controlled almost totally by men, built on fear and ignorance of women, seeking to manipulate the system to need of a few."

Through fund raising, public relations expertise and political consultants, and New Right is attempting to identify with voters who will respond to special-interest campaigns.

Rather than offering traditional, positive, solutions to modern problems, "opposition" is the key word to New Right politics. The new conservatives promoting the Right are opposing major issues such as ERA, organized labor, the Panama Canal treaty, SALT II, gay rights, and abortion rights.

New Right followers don't want to "waste time on old battles," Minority Whip Ted Stevens says. "Perhaps we had to watch as the Democrats tried to prove that government could do everything in order to show that it could not."

Viguerie thinks religious leaders have every right to speak out, however, "when the government is involving itself in family matters and moral issues. The left has been doing it and now the right is going to."

The organizational network of the New Right is loose, but productive. The main threads of the New Right network are four men: Viguerie, Howard Phillips, Terry Dolan, and Paul Weyrich.

New Right members include a conservative core of about 20 senators including Jake Gern of Utah; Richard Lugar, Indiana; Paul Laxalt, Nevada; Orrin Hatch, Utah; Jesse Holms, North Carolina, and Jim McClure, Idaho. Representative Philip Crane is also a major figure in the New Right.

In 1965 Viguerie organized a direct-mail firm for conservatives and their causes. Today that firm, now in Falls Church, VA,

grosses \$20 million through plugging new activist groups including the Conservative Caucus, the Committee for Survival of a Free Congress, and the National Conservative Political Action Committee.

Phillips helps maintain the Conservative Caucus: a nonpartisan group which concentrates on national issues and local organizations. This group is particularly concerned with fighting against SALT II.

Weyrich helps lead the Committee for Survival of a Free Congress which emphasizes campaign organization and funding. A former Republican Senate staff aide and Greek Catholic, Weyrich began involving prominent Evangelical Fundamentalists in right wing politics.

Dolan is the leading figure behind the National Conservative Political Action Committee (NCPAC), which emphasizes publicity and collects funds nationwide to target specific campaigns. The NCPAC affiliates with groups such as Stop the Baby Killers, Citizens Committee for the Right to Keep and Bear Arms, National Right to Work Committee, and Stop ERA.

Weyrich hopes that some of the New Right activities will spark a "conservative revolution. Not necessarily that we want to conserve what we have only for ourselves," he explained, "but conservative in the sense that we want to change the power structure that has been running Washington for years."

DUBUQUELAND'S LUXURY THEATRES

WEEKDAYS 7:20 & 9:25

SAT. & SUN. 1:10 3:15

5:15 7:20 & 9:25

THE BEST MAN FOR
THE JOB... IS A
WOMAN!

**PRIVATE
BENJAMIN**

Goldie Hawn
Robert Webber

WEEKDAYS 7:40 & 9:45

SAT. & SUN. 1:50 3:50

Just when she
thought she had
everything right.

*"At last.
Mr. Wrong."*
**It's
My Turn**
A funny love story.

Jill Clayburgh
Michael Douglas

**Cinema
Center**

500-0020

75 JF KENNEDY ROAD

WEEKDAYS 7:40 & 9:40

SAT. & SUN. 1:40 3:40

5:40 7:40 & 9:40

*And lo, there was
another movie.*

**OH, GOD!
BOOK II**

George Burns

PG

WEEKDAYS

7:25 & 9:30

SAT. & SUN.




1:15 3:20 5:20 7:25 & 9:30

*It takes all kinds of
critters to make
Farmer Vincent Fritters*
**MOTEL
HELL**

Rory Calhoun

**SUPER 20 DRIVE-IN THEATRE
CLOSED FOR THE SEASON!**

Campaign '80





Candidates identified in debate

By Jill Hickey
Editor

"The only difference between the two candidates for the 2nd Congressional seat is their height," said one observer of the Congressional candidates' debate at Five Flags Center between Tom Tauke and Steve Sovern, Oct. 19.

Of the ten questions posed to the two candidates, only three produced direct conflict. The other seven indicated similar stands by both candidates.

The hour-long debate concluded on an old issue. Sovern challenged Tauke for the source of his campaign contributions in 1978. Sovern claimed that \$10,700 for Tauke's campaign came from big oil political action groups which "could have influenced his opinions while in Congress."

Tauke admitted to the contributions but stipulated that no oil companies are backing him this year. He said his record in Congress justifies the lack of support. Tauke said he initiated legislation investigating oil companies and examining oil market practices.

Sovern and Tauke hold very different views on our present defense system, particularly regarding the MX missile. Tauke encourages the building of this missile "as soon as possible," rather than waiting "for a better one next year." He feels our system is not as good as that of the Soviet Union and therefore requires immediate attention.

Sovern opposes the MX missile altogether, however. He feels the strong impact of \$30-\$90 billion that the missile would cost taxpayers is too much on the American people. Sovern does support the "submersible underground missile, or SUM." SUM would cost taxpayers less than the MX in both taxes and worry, according to Sovern.

The subject of a federal Department of Education also produces opposite opinions from Tauke and Sovern. Tauke feels that elementary and secondary levels should be controlled at the local level. He said that he cannot see how the federal government can't get involved in the local school boards if it maintains a federal department.

Sovern feels that the Department would be "a major step to improve education." He said it would maintain local government power, "from which the strength of the Department would come. A federal Department of Education would also reduce the time required for education policy changes, therefore saving efficiency in government," according to Sovern.

In answer to the question of what is being done to ensure money for homebuyers, Tauke said that any action would have to be based on the assumption that "we're able to control budget spending." He pointed out that "last year the legislature exceeded their budget by almost 16%. And, so far this year, no budget has been adopted, even though it was due in September."

Sovern didn't mention budgets in his response, however, but said that "we need a policy to ensure a free flow of credit for homeowners." Sovern feels that by "assuring homes we will maintain jobs at this recessionary time."

Both Sovern and Tauke support the passage of the state Equal Rights Amendment, denying any connection between ERA and the abortion issue.

Sovern said, "Equal rights also signifies human rights and dignity, therefore, I cannot see how the two can be linked. I feel the abortion issue is a scare tactic used to confuse the Equal Rights Amendment."

Tauke and Sovern agree that religious leaders influence the country and that morality is important to honest politics. However, both also feel that religious leaders are wrong when they take a stand on issues that are not specifically religious, like the Panama Canal and the Department of Education issues.

The two candidates agree that a national health insurance program is not affordable right now, and neither would include federal workers in the present Social Security system. Sovern and Tauke agreed that the Soviet Union grain embargo should be lifted to benefit farmers, and that a government by, for and of the people is America. Consequently, both disagreed with the suggestion of creating a separate, governing class to "keep amateurs out of government."



The last Tauke-Sovern debate was held in Dubuque's Five Flags Center Sunday, October 19.

ERA important in Iowa elections

By Yvonne Yoerger
Staff Writer

"A vote for ERA is a vote for homosexuality, abortion, and women in the draft."

"A 'no' vote on ERA: 'One small step for man, one giant leap backward for woman-kind.'"

These and other claims are being heard more and more frequently. But what is the center of the debate? The Equal Rights Amendment itself is one short paragraph:

"All men and women are, by nature, free and equal, and have certain inalienable rights — among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness. *Neither the State nor any of its political subdivisions shall, on the basis of gender, deny or restrict the equality of rights under the law.*" (The italicized words are those proposed to be added to the Iowa Constitution, the rest of the paragraph is the present wording.)

Opponents argue that the amendment doesn't say anything new, because women are already protected by existing laws. Carol Foht, of Dubuque's Stop ERA group, said a woman in Iowa has all the rights she needs under at least six legislative acts: the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the Equal Employment Opportunities Act of 1972, the Federal Minimum Wage Act of 1974, the Iowa Civil Rights Act of 1965, the Higher Education Act of 1972 and the 1974 Equal Credit Opportunities Act, as well as the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution.


Clarke senior Janet Lallier agreed. "The inherent rights for women are already there," she said. "The 14th Amendment includes 'citizens or persons' in the rights it guarantees. It doesn't say anything about excepting women from those rights."

But ERA supporters say the 14th Amendment and the other laws leave loopholes in protecting women. They point to legal evidence that most cases brought to court for making different classifications of people, including those classifications made by gender, are decided under a "rational basis" test.

Supporters also say that the separate laws for equality would be easier to enforce if they were brought together under a Constitutional Amendment. Sister Helen Garvey, vice-president of the Congregation of the Sisters of the Blessed Virgin Mary (BVM), said that is one of the reasons the BVM's have gone on record in favor of the ERA.

"Those laws are not sufficient," Garvey said. "If they were, there wouldn't be the number of people reacting to the push for equal rights now." The BVM Senate passed its statement supporting ERA in 1973 "because of heightening awareness of the many and varied injustices to which women throughout the world are subjected."

But some opponents would rather work for attitudinal changes than legal changes. Foht said it is better for women to get jobs on their own worth, as they do now, than to be hired to fill a quota.



Pro ERA representatives can frequently be seen throughout Dubuque distributing pamphlets and informing people about the Amendment.

photo by Marybeth Carroll

"The big misconception is that people think ERA is automatically going to get them equal jobs," she said. "Right now, it's tough for both men and women to find jobs. We're still going to have to fight for jobs with ERA, but I think the good feelings a woman has inside herself after an accomplishment will disappear if she knows the only reason she was hired was because of ERA quotas."

The groups pushing for ERA say that the attitudinal changes will only come after the legal changes. "We respect the dignity of every human person," Garvey said. "That dignity will include the right of individual families and social institutions to make their own decisions about equality. The ERA will only affect legal matters."

ERA supporters also bring up the fact that any session of the state legislature could change any of the present, separate laws, but an amendment to the Constitution would be more permanent.

While ERA opponents claim the amendment's language is too vague, proponents call it "streamlined." Clarke senior Luanne Sweeney said the language was carefully chosen. "It's important to have that law on the books in an understandable form. I think it will eliminate fears people have that are after the fact."

Opponents often quote the June-July 1977 "Congressional Digest," which says vagueness is the most obvious problem with ERA: "...no one can say what it really means... (a debate) is rather a debate over what we are debating about."

Foht said the vagueness of the amendment is the factor that allows opponents to link ERA with other issues. She said possibilities for legalized abortion on demand and homosexual marriages; required coed sports in public schools and required coed restrooms in public places; and forced registration for women in the draft are left open.

Pro-ERA groups point out that special amendments dealing with those issues could still be passed, and many states with ERA have amendments prohibiting some or all of those practices. However, the Iowa legislature has already defeated amendments on each of those subjects with the proposed ERA.

Supporters, however, say other states with ERA provide a good base for comparison. "We are defending the oppressed people of all groups," Garvey said. "The other states show that it can be done, but it's the same when women got the right to vote. The opponents are putting more in it than is there."

Clarke freshman Lori Dunn, from Minnesota, agreed. "We have ERA in Minnesota and there is a difference in states that have and ones that don't," she said. "The equal rights are more evident there than in Iowa. Here everyone talks about equality, but in Minnesota I think you can see equality."

Both opponents and proponents remind voters of the difference between the federal and state amendments. The proposed federal amendment has been on the books since 1972. During the seven-year period allowed for ratification, 35 states adopted the ERA. But a 38 state majority was needed to get the amendment into the Constitution, so a three-year extension was granted in 1979. Now ERA forces argue about the constitutional validity of that extension, especially since five states have now rescinded their ratifications.

For the state ERA to be adopted, it has to be passed by two separate sessions of the legislature and then on a general ballot. Iowa's proposed ERA has been passed by the two legislative sessions, and if it goes through on next week's popular vote, it will become part of the State Constitution.

DUBUQUE MINING COMPANY

KENNEDY MALL

MINER'S BILL OF FARE

HEARTY MINER'S VITTLES

MAIN COURSE

Charburger Au Natural	\$2.50
with Cheese (American or Swiss)	2.60
with sliced Mushrooms	2.75
with Lettuce & Tomato	2.75
with Canadian Bacon	2.75
Combination (our most popular)	2.95
(1/3 lb. pure beef — pre cooked weight)	
Steak Sandwich	3.75
4-5 oz. sirloin (real steak)	
Bratwurst Patty with Sauerkraut	2.60



All sandwiches served with French fries & pickle spear.

APPETIZERS OR TO GO WITHS

	Half	Full
French Fries	.97	1.85
Breaded Mushrooms	1.50	2.25
Onion Rings	.97	1.85
Breaded Cauliflower	1.35	2.25
Egg Rolls	1.50	2.50
Breaded Cheddar Crisps	1.75	3.25

MINING CO. SPECIALS

Monday

1/3 LB. CHARBURGER \$2.60
topped with melted Swiss Cheese and Chopped Green Olives

Tuesday

PORK TENDERLOIN \$2.50
served with Lettuce, Mayonnaise & Tomato

Wednesday

BEEF BURGUNDY A LA DMC \$2.95
1/3 lb. Charburger smothered with a Burgundy Wine Mushroom Sauce and served on a Sour Dough Bun

Thursday

MINING CO. "KINDA RUBEN" \$2.95
1/3 lb. Charburger, Swiss Cheese, Canadian Bacon, Sauerkraut, and Thousand Island Dressing on a Dark Rye Bun

Every Day

HUGE FISH SANDWICH \$2.95

w/ Cheese, Tartar Sauce and Fries

The DMC "not your every day" Salad Bar

with a Sandwich.....\$1.50 All by itself2.95

All Sandwiches gladly packed to take to your own diggings.
Serving from 11:00 a.m. until 1:00 a.m. (at nite)
Serving Generations, Fine Food Since April, 1977

THE BLOW OUT

Southern Comfort & Gin — Served Flaming
(as long as the waitress doesn't walk too fast)

\$3.00



MINER'S PASSION

A special blend of forbidden fruit & Passion Liquors
— Just what the name implies

\$1.75

DYNAMITE

Vodka & Orange Curacao
Should only be drunk while wearing a hard hat.

\$1.75



THE CAVE IN

2 of these and you will think a ton of rocks fell on you!
Gin, Vodka, Light & Dark Rum

\$3.00



THE SHAFT

Blended fruit juices, NO liquor but we still get 75¢ for it.

THE BLUE MINER

2 of these and the mine will have to come to you.

\$1.50

MINER'S SLING

Drink it slow and stand up the same way.



MINER'S MIA-TIA

Rum, Rum, 151 Rum — with exotic fruit juices.

\$3.00

Open Sunday — Noon to 10:00 p.m.

DMC

Super Sunday

\$1 Off
Charburger Combination
Sundays only

Expires Nov. 14

COMMENT

Media image sells candidates

During their campaigns, political candidates rely on the media to inform the public on how they view certain issues. The issues are important, but how a candidate is presented through the media can be the deciding factor in a campaign victory.

Are we choosing our politicians on how they stand on the issues or are we choosing our politicians on how they are presented through the media?

After the Kennedy-Nixon debate, it was obvious who the press favored. Kennedy was the young, good looking, honest and poised candidate, while Nixon was not so young, not so good looking and nervous. Kennedy was the favorite. He appealed to the press.

Like Theodore Roosevelt, Kennedy was well spoken and dynamic, which enabled the print medium to write exciting copy. Exciting copy sells newspapers.

The media picked up on Kennedy's past as a war hero and presented him to the public as the "all-American" candidate. Who else would we rather have run our country than an all-American who loves baseball, apple pie and comes across as a strong, loyal American on television.

Most people associate acting with television. Is what we see on television the real candidate or a person who can act and use the media as a tool to persuade people who do not look beyond the politician's media image? Adlai Stevenson, former Illinois politician, said this presidential campaign will be decided by the press or by which candidate has the best cosmetologist.

Candidates have been known to change their views on certain issues during the course of their campaigns. One Clarke student feels candidates answer questions on the basis of how they think the media wants the questions answered. By doing this, the candidate will be presented positively in the public eye.

The Courier encourages you to look beyond the media image of the candidates and weigh the pros and cons of the issues before you vote. The candidate who looked so good on television, sounded so good on radio and was so exciting to read about could be the candidate who voted for a policy or an amendment that you strongly oppose. When voting, remember politicians' decisions affect our present lives as well as how we will live in the future.

MBC



"A Midsummer Night's Dream," William Shakespeare's classic comedy of love and magic, will be staged by the Clarke College drama department at 8 p.m., Friday through Sunday, Oct. 31-Nov. 2 in Terence Donaghoe Hall. Clarke students may use CSA tickets for admission to the play.



photos by Lucy Kennedy

A Republican choice

Continued from page 1

The Republican platform opposes the Equal Rights Amendment although Reagan has said he supports "equality for women." Reagan specifies that he does not support women in a military draft but would like to integrate more women in some "traditional male positions in other areas."

Even with cuts in taxes and therefore cuts in revenue, Reagan supports the building up of our military system. He would like to increase pay and benefits for military personnel to give them incentive to build a professional military force. By maintaining a professional military, Reagan hopes to achieve over military and technological superiority over the Soviet Union.

Reagan hopes to reduce the federal authority in public education by eliminating the Department of Education. He hopes to reduce welfare costs by providing "comprehensive programs for disadvantaged youth" although he does not specify what these programs would be.

In addition to providing jobs, Reagan plans to improve the American lifestyle by enforcing strong criminal punishments, especially in the areas of illegal drug traffic and the sale of drug paraphernalia.

In foreign policy, his emphasis lies with a "stern approach to the Soviet Union," caution towards China, a tilt towards Israel in the Middle East, and developing closer ties with Mexico and Canada.

If elected, Reagan promises to "start being president in my first 24 hours, and not spend my first term, as many presidents do, merely preparing to run for a second term." He feels he has the strength of his party behind him and a "get-going" attitude which will restore America to the "respected country it used to be."

—CALENDAR—

Wednesday, November 5, will be "A Night at the Races" in Clarke's Union. This CSA sponsored event will begin at 9:30 p.m. Admission is \$1 or CSA ticket.

* * *

THE COURIER

Member Associated College Press

Published weekly during the school year except during Thanksgiving, Christmas and Easter vacations, and examination periods by students of Clarke College.

Editor: Jill Hickey
Associate Editor: Marybeth Carro
Photo Editor: Lucy Kennedy
Business Manager: Sharon Green
Advisor: Patricia Prijatel Kucer

Staff Reporters: Karen Gutzat, Robert Hartnett, Eileen Hennessey, Mike Keating, Darlene Long, Piz Petty, Kim Pinneke, Anne Whitehead, Yvonne Yoerge

Staff Photographers: Stacey Blake, Karen Gutzat, Darlene Long

Staff Artist: Liz Petty